

**REMARKS**

Upon entry of the Amendment, Claims 1-37, 39 and 41-45 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 38, 40 and 46-47 are canceled.

Reconsideration and review of the claims on the merits are respectfully requested.

***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 1-45 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sawamoto or Isono for the reasons given in the Office Action.

The Examiner's position remains as stated in the June 22, 2001 Office Action.

Applicants respond as follows.

First, with respect to the current 103(a) rejection, Applicants respectively request clarification as to whether or not the Examiner is maintaining Arnold as a prior art reference. The Examiner omits reference to Arnold at the top of page 2 of the Detailed Action, but then states that the Examiner's position remains as stated in the June 22, 2001, Office action, in which Arnold was the primary reference for one of the 103(a) rejections. Applicants respectfully request clarification in the next correspondence.

Applicants submit that the term "self-crosslinkable" is understood by one skilled in the art. However, Applicants amend Claim 1 to clarify, but not by way of limitation, which functional group is self-crosslinkable by reciting: "an adhesive composition comprising a thermoplastic and water dispersible high molecular weight polymer (A) containing a crosslinkable functional group as a pendant group, wherein the crosslinkable functional group is

self-crosslinkable, and substantially free of carbon-carbon double bonds....” (Please see Listing of Claims for full claim).

As seen from the amended claims, the present invention is directed to a cord for a rubber article as well as a rubber article using the cord and a pneumatic tire using the rubber article. Support can be found, for example, starting at page 78, paragraph (7), in the specification as originally filed, in the description of the examples. Applicant submits that no new matter is added.

Accordingly, the present invention is in an entirely different field from the cited references to Sawamoto and/or Isono and cannot easily be conceived therefrom.

Isono is concerned with a lithographic printing material supported on an aluminum substrate but does not utterly teach or suggest that this material has a good influence upon the adhesion between rubber and fiber. Sawamoto relates to a pressure-sensitive adhesive tape in which a pressure-sensitive adhesive layer is formed on a foam backing tape. Isono and Sawamoto are entirely different from the present invention in the object of their inventions. Therefore, the present invention can not easily be conceived from either Isono or Sawamoto.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

### ***Conclusion***

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No. 09/623,140

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



John K. Shin  
Registration No. 48,409

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 1, 2003